

file

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
<input type="checkbox"/>	UNCLASSIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/>	CONFIDENTIAL
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	SECRET
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	Director, OSR		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIRECT REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	DISPATCH
<input type="checkbox"/>	COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE
<input type="checkbox"/>	CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/>	INFORMATION
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	PREPARE REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	RECOMMENDATION
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	SIGNATURE
Remarks: <p>Herewith a copy of my memo to the DCI on your Discussion/Dinner topic with his response.</p> <p>I have negotiated tentatively the date, Wednesday, 6 December, for our meeting.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 100px; margin: 20px auto;"></div>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 20px; display: inline-block;"></div> CAR/NFAC			10/11/78
<input type="checkbox"/>	UNCLASSIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/>	CONFIDENTIAL
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	SECRET

FORM NO. 1-67

237

Use previous editions

(40)

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
<input type="checkbox"/>	UNCLASSIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/>	CONFIDENTIAL
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	SECRET
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	NFAC/CAR		
2	TE48 Hdgs		
3			
4			
5			
6			
<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIRECT REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	DISPATCH
<input type="checkbox"/>	COMMENT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/>	CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/>	SIGNATURE
Remarks: <p style="text-align: center;">LCD approved</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Discussion/Quines</p> <p style="text-align: center;">#Six</p>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
<input type="checkbox"/>	UNCLASSIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/>	CONFIDENTIAL
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	SECRET

FORM NO. 1-67

237

Use previous editions

(40)

NFAC No. 4083/78

20 September 1978

STAT

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

VIA : Director, National Foreign Assessment Center

FROM : Coordinator for Academic Relations and
External Analytical Support, NFAC

SUBJECT : A Subject for a Future DCI Discussion/Dinner

1. Action Requested: Approval of the topic, "Verification, Including Monitoring, of Arms Control Agreements," as the subject of a DCI Discussion/Dinner to be scheduled around the first of December.

2. Background: You have approved the topic, "Lags in Soviet Advance in Science and Technology," as the subject for a Discussion/Dinner to be held on 18 October. We should be planning now for a second meeting before Christmas. The subject of verification standards from arms control agreements, including the role of monitoring, was suggested some time ago by Sid Graybeal as one that he might work up for a future discussion/dinner. The subject is an interesting one. There are varied conceptions of the verification measures we are justified in accepting, specifically in arms control agreements with the Soviets. Monitoring is one of the means of verification. But the terms verification and monitoring are not synonymous, hence our acceptability requirements (for verification in general and monitoring specifically) are distinct though obviously related. For example, there is always some level of verification by national means alone and monitoring will vary in effectiveness depending on the circumstances, including the nature of the monitoring. This is true for us; presumably it is also true for the Soviets. So one question for exploration is what levels-of-confidence, as regards any measures of verification agreed upon, the Soviets will accept. But there are other questions of equal interest, including differences of perspective regarding verification as between various elements of the United States Government.

NFAC No. 4083/78

SUBJECT: A Subject for a Future DCI Discussion/Dinner


3. This subject is one that should be of considerable interest to academic and other outside specialists on arms control although, to our knowledge, none of them has addressed the issues directly. The subject is also of obvious interest to the arms-control community inside the Government. Furthermore, despite its technical aspects, the subject is one that lends itself to discussion in broad, philosophical terms.

4. If you approve, we shall propose a guest list representing State, Defense, and ACDA from inside the Government and from two or more of the major academic centers of arms control research, perhaps beginning with MIT and Stanford. We have not begun exploring who the best candidates from these sources would be as we have not wished to stimulate their interest without your approval.

5. Recommendation: That you approve the topic, "Arms Control Verification, Including Monitoring," to be prepared for a Discussion/Dinner to be scheduled towards the end of November or early in December.

STAT

APPROVED:


Director of Central Intelligence

7 OCT 1978

Date

DISAPPROVED:

Director of Central Intelligence

Date

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/01/10 : CIA-RDP86B00985R000200160017-6

Approved For Release 2005/01/10 : CIA-RDP86B00985R000200160017-6